

Date: Fri, 30 Jul 93 04:30:13 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #272  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 30 Jul 93                      Volume 93 : Issue    272

Today's Topics:

    1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.  
        1947 No Code Survey: Results???)  
        ARRL Internet connection  
        Call sign snobbery  
        Give a VE \$5.60, walk (2 msgs)  
        How many use CW? (2 msgs)  
    Profanity was(Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)  
        Real CBers (2 msgs)  
    STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Mon, 26 Jul 93 18:17:02 GMT  
From: sdd.hp.com!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!apple!apple.com!  
netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!lando.la.locus.com!  
dana@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 1947 No Code survey (was Re: References for Code vs.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CArxt0.71x@egr.uri.edu> swamik@orca.ele.uri.edu (Swami Kumaresan)  
writes:

>  
>Some idiot wrote:

C'mon Swami, you want people to calm down and you start a message like  
this? Gack.

>>Attn. Rev. turkey there is no license called CodelessTech!!!  
>  
>>Why in the hell should I learn 13 wpm Moris to work the satellites?  
>  
>>Rev Rod      Universal Life Church (I payed \$1 in 1970 for the Rev. part)  
>>My rev is just as good as your rev but I an not such a big JERK.  
>  
>Calm down!!!!!!    ..\_    .. \_... .. \_\_\_ \_ .-.-.-

I'll translate Swami's little Morse message:  
U IDIOT.

Are you trying to get someone to calm down? Or are you trying to  
make sure rec.radio.amateur.policy never discusses anything reasonably  
but instead remains a flaming war?

>Someone else wrote:  
>  
>>What's really interesting about being a no-coder on 2m is that there is  
>>an unending stream of old farts with holier-than-thou attitudes who make the  
>>band sound like CB by going on about 10-40 roger and all the good numbers.  
>  
>>I've never heard anything CB-ish uttered by anyone other than a VE3xx (that's  
>>a full priv advanced class license with 10+ years). Seems that it must  
>>be the code types that have the CB problem.  
>  
>>Perhaps if the old-farts-with-attitude spent some of their time doing  
>>constructive things like HELPING PEOPLE LEARN CODE, rather than running  
>>people down for not having the precious code, more people might learn it. On  
>>the other hand, when they sit back and bitch about no-coders, they sound  
>>just like the brain-dead goons on CB going on about how tough they are.  
>  
>\_\_\_ ..... \_...\_\_    ...    .....    ..\_    \_    ...    \_...\_

Swami sez:  
OH, SHUT UP

Such mature, relaxing words.

>  
>  
>What is this? rec.radio.amateur.flame.flame.flame!  
>I sure hope no non- or prospective hams are reading all this crap!  
>  
>KB1AMB/AA

Is this the kettle calling the pot black?

--

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are \*  
\* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----

Date: 26 Jul 1993 20:12:16 -0500  
From: sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: 1947 No Code Survey: Results???  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>  
> What is this? rec.radio.amateur.flame.flame.flame!  
> I sure hope no non- or prospective hams are reading all this crap!

Au contraire: I hope they are!  
This will give them an indication of what "real" hams are like ...

And just where \*are\* the results of this survey? \_Must\_ be the ARRL  
hidin' 'em. Yeah, that's it.

Have a safe and super fine one.

Peter Laws | "The '90s are gonna make the '60s|plaws@uafhp.uark.edu  
n5uwy@ka5bml.ar.usa.noam| look like the '50s" --D. Hopper|plaws@uafsysb.bitnet

-----

Date: 29 Jul 93 13:52:20 GMT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: ARRL Internet connection  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, datwyler@moons.sim.es.com (Doug Datwyler) writes:  
>I agree that the ARRL should be here, as they are promoting the hobby,  
>adding to discussions, fueling flames, dousing flames, etc....  
>  
>This discussion should end soon.

Yes, please. The "vote" in news and email is one against, everyone  
else for. Case closed.

-----

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org

American Radio Relay League |  
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111 |

-----  
Date: 29 Jul 93 14:26:54 GMT  
From: drt@athena.mit.edu  
Subject: Call sign snobbery  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jul28.100634@IASTATE.EDU> wjturner@IASTATE.EDU (William J Turner) writes:

Thank you for the explanation. However, I think you're math is off also.  
M is 7 units long (3+1+3), not 9. Thus:

>  
> N7WIM = 5+3 + 13+3 + 9+3 + 3+3 + 9+7 = 58  
>

should be:

N7WIM = 5+3 + 13+3 + 9+3 + 3+3 + 7+7 = 56

ARRRRGH! and Touche'. I looked at the "M" and thought "K".

Javier, OH8/AH6MM sent me email wondering how you figure this out, so  
I'm posting it here:

Each dit is 1  
each dah is 3  
each intracharacter space is 1  
each space between chars is 3  
each word space is 7

and you have to have a word space at the end of your callsign unless  
you send like some people I know:  
dahdidahdidahdahdidahdahdidahdidahdahdi...

So,    K        G        2        S  
is    9+3 + 9+3 + 15+3 + 5+7 = 54 units long

Kok AA6TY's method works too. I find the calculations at least as  
cumbersome but it's easier to remember:

Length = 2\*(dits+chars) + 4\*(dahs+words)

So, AH6MM = 2\*(9+5) + 4\*(6+1) = 56

and OH8/AH6MM = 2\*(18+9) + 4\*(14+1) = 114

--

-----  
David R. Tucker           KG2S           drt@athena.mit.edu

|'Most political sermons teach the congregation nothing except       |  
what newspapers are taken at the Rectory.' -C.S. Lewis

-----  
Date: Mon, 26 Jul 1993 05:33:59 GMT

From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com

Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

st2cm@jane.uh.edu (Coyle, Robert L.) writes:

>In article <1993Jul24.220849.8972@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com>, little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com  
(nuts2u::little) >

>[stuff deleted]

>>If you don't care, then shut up. The rest of us are tired of hearing you

>>whine about something you don't even care about. Do you just like seeing

>

>I think some of us have often thought the same about you, Todd.

Yeah, but at least I care about the issues. I also don't spend most of my  
time denigrating a class of amateurs simple because they chose to enter the  
hobby without passing element 1A.

>Now, don't get me wrong, I \*am\* in support of a no-code (aka "no-clue")  
>ticket...just not in its current form. I believe one of the supporting  
>arguments was to encourage the utilization of bands we are in grave  
>danger of losing (i.e. 222, 420, 902, and so on). Well, that sounds all  
>nice and fine in theory, but not in fact. Here in Houston, virtually all  
>of these new hams have headed straight for Two Meters.

Does calling it a "no-clue" license help soothe your conscience? After  
all, they aren't "real" hams, they're just "no clues". (Why does this sound  
so much like the 60's and another much larger group of supposed second  
class citizens)

Also, I now see the logic in what you support. Those bands weren't good  
enough for the existing amateur population to use, so we create a new  
second class group of hams and give them the table scraps. How quaint.  
You're as bad as my neighbors. I think they call it NIMBY.

Personally as someone that started out with a no code license, I spend as little time on 2 meter and 70 cm repeaters as possible. If that's what amateur radio is all about, why not just get a cellular phone?

73,  
Todd  
N9MWB

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 93 04:52:57 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Give a VE \$5.60, walk  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

floyd@nraven.wariat.org (Douglas Dever) writes:

> as a final note: I'd like to see the finals on that 80m radio with the  
> tuner and the 11M antenna....

Actually I'd say the finals would be in very good shape. It's been said that with a good tuner, you could actually tune a set of bedsprings. Matter of fact, people are actually using Slinky antennas, and they tune alright.

Tony

-----  
o o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE  
 \ / system @ garlic.sbs.com Soon W5YI VE  
 \ /  
 (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.  
 /| \ /  
 / | {MTV}|| MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's  
\* ||{ }||  
 ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)  
 ^^ ^^  
-----

-----  
Date: 28 Jul 93 16:00:42 EDT  
From: mcsun!sunic!psinntp!psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: How many use CW?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:  
>The only relevent metric is whether the skill is still in significant use  
>in the service in question -- the Amateur Service. It is. QED.

According to the market-research survey commissioned by the ARRL last year, the following percentages of active amateurs use the indicated modes:

SSB	69%
FM	77%
AM	12%
Packet	24%
RTTY	10%
AMTOR	6%
CW	38%
Slow-scan TV	1%
Fast-scan TV	3%
Weather FAX	4%
Other	1%

(These are the percentages of ACTIVE amateurs. About 30% of licensed amateurs are inactive, according to the survey.)

For the statisticians among you, the margin of error for these data is +/- 2.1% at the 95% confidence level.

Now you can fight over whether 38% is significant.

-----  
Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbbloom@arrl.org  
American Radio Relay League |  
225 Main St., Newington CT 06111

Date: 29 Jul 93 12:25:59 GMT  
From: psinnntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: How many use CW?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.policy, jbbloom@arrl.org (Jon Bloom, KE3Z) writes:

>In rec.radio.amateur.policy, paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>>The only relevant metric is whether the skill is still in significant use  
>>in the service in question -- the Amateur Service. It is. QED.

>According to the market-research survey commissioned by the ARRL  
>last year, the following percentages of active amateurs use the  
>indicated modes:

> SSB 69%

> FM 77%  
> AM 12%  
> Packet 24%  
> RTTY 10%  
> AMTOR 6%  
> CW 38%  
>Slow-scan TV 1%  
>Fast-scan TV 3%  
> Weather FAX 4%  
> Other 1%

>(These are the percentages of ACTIVE amateurs. About 30% of licensed  
>amateurs are inactive, according to the survey.)

>For the statisticians among you, the margin of error for these data  
>is +/- 2.1% at the 95% confidence level.

>Now you can fight over whether 38% is significant.

It is interesting that the number of hams that use CW is greater than  
the number of hams that use packet and amtor, two modes that are touted  
as high-tech and "modern."

All of this has no direct bearing on whether the Amateur Radio Service  
should have a continuing requirement. It does, however, negate the argument  
that CW should not be required \*because\* no one uses it.

I will point out that I am 99% CW myself, but do not feel that hams  
who do or not use CW are any better than any other. One's status in  
life should be determined by how one conducts one's self, not the  
mechanism used during that conduct. In fact, I truly hope that not  
all hams use CW all of the time; I want room on the CW bands for  
my QRP signal. :-).

73 from ARRL HQ, Ed

-----

Ed Hare, KA1CV  
American Radio Relay League  
225 Main St.  
Newington, CT 06111  
(203) 666-1541 - voice  
ARRL Laboratory Supervisor  
RFI, xmtr and rcvr testing

ehare@arrl.org

"You will never put the puzzle together  
if you keep putting all of the pieces  
back in the box." Colleen

-----

-----



Date: 29 Jul 93 13:35:03 GMT  
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!  
dgg.cr.usgs.gov!bodoh@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Profanity was(Re: Give a VE \$5.60, walk)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CAtu1A.Mrz@hpbbrd.bbn.hp.com>, uweb@PROBLEM\_WITH\_INEWS\_GATEWAY\_FILE  
(Uwe\_Behle) writes:

|>  
|> Right! During the last 15 years I noticed that it it getting harder  
|> and harder to find people on the bands who can join into a discussion  
|> about technical stuff. This is due to the type of exams they do nowadays.  
|> You just learn the answers to all questions in a little booklet, take  
|> the test and you are a "wall-plug-amateur" that is somebody who knows  
|> little more about technical issues than where the electricity for hir  
|> rig comes from (the wall socket). I have noticed that the percentage  
|> of knowledgeable people is very high among the high-speed cw ops. That  
|> is one of the reasons for me to do mostly cw on hf bands.  
|>  
|> Uwe (DF3DU)

--

Are you saying that knowing code has somehow imparted some  
divine wisdom on those hams who operate at 20+WPM? I argue that these  
same hams would have the same wisdom whether they knew/used code  
or not. I can see your point about the THEORY test now being easy enough  
to pass by memorizing versus learning - but do you mean to say that there  
is some connection between knowing high speed code and wisdom? I suppose  
that many of the high speed coders are of the old school who had to take  
more difficult theory tests - but knowledge of code and theory are totally  
seperate issues.

One could also argue that the level of knowledge of electronic theory is  
slipping, but knowledge of digital systems is certainly rising - which  
goes along with how the rest of the world is going. Years ago, field  
engineers for most big computer companies would troubleshoot a board and  
replace a component on the spot. Now, the new breed of "engineers" are  
less knowledgable about the individual components and simply treat whole  
boards as components. And when the defective board is sent in, typically  
it is either thrown away or the problem is found with a test jig. Someone  
still has to program the test jigs and design the boards, but overall there  
are probably fewer people who really understand the nitty-gritty. Even  
those who design the boards have help from software tools. On the other  
hand, understanding of digital logic has increased.

I'm not sure whether this is progress or whether we are loosing valuable  
skills. I agree that the theory tests should be more than memorization  
but I also believe that they should include more digital logic questions.

++++++  
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, NOY?? (in the mail) +  
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +  
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)  
+  
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P  
+  
++++++

-----  
Date: 28 Jul 93 16:43:23 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Real CBers  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

swamik@orca.NoSubdomain.NoDomain (Swami Kumaresan) writes:

>>>rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu (Mr. Nice Guy) writes:  
>  
>>> I seem to remember that shortly after the big CB bust when CB went to 40  
>>> channels that many of real CBers learned to talk in Morris and got  
>>>  
>>> Rev. Rod (genuwin mail order minister)  
>  
>>Learned to talk in Morris? Negatory, Good Buddy. That's Morse,  
>>like horse. Ten-Four?  
>  
>> --Robert  
>  
>  
> Yeah, and thats GENUINE, now u try it, G-E-N-U-I-N-E  
>  
> God! What an .. -.. .. --- - !  
>  
> -.. . -.- -.... .---- .- -- -.... -... .- .-

... .-- .- -- .. --..-- .-- -- .. --. .... - -. --- -  
.- .- -. - - --- ..- .... . -.-. --- -.. . .... -. -.-. .  
- ..... . -. --- -. .-.. ..- .-.. .. -.-. .-.. ..  
.- --- -. - -.... . - -.... .-.. . - --- .- .- .. - .-.-.-  
--.... ....- -.. . -.- -.. .---- -. .- .-.-. ....-.-

```

-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
        \    / system @ garlic.sbs.com                Soon W5YI VE
          \__/_/
            (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
      /|  ___ \
    / | {MTV} || MoooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
  *  || {___} ||
    ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
    ^^      ^^
-----

```

```

-----
Date: Mon, 26 Jul 93 04:30:26 GMT
From: mnemosyne.cs.du.edu!nyx!rcanders@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Real CBers
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```

I seem to remember that shortly after the big CB bust when CB went to 40 channels that many of real CBers learned to talk in Morris and got their ham licences. Most of the new Technician class hams I have met seem to have a technical background rather than being CBers, of course I don't hang around on the local repeaters except for the AMSAT net.

Rev. Rod (genuwin mail order minister)

```

--
Rod Anderson NONZO      | "I do not think the United States government
Boulder, CO             | is responsible for the fact that a bunch of
rcanders@nyx.cs.du.edu  | fanatics decided to kill themselves"
satellite NONZO on ao-16 | Slick Willie the Compassionate

```

```

-----
Date: 27 Jul 93 04:40:24 GMT
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net
Subject: STILL waiting for your license? Read this and weep!
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```

bjahnke@arrl.org (Bart Jahnke) writes:

```

>>What size does the license copy have to be trimmed to?
>
> To the border of the pocket or certificate sized license (where it

```

> states to "cut along this line").

Bart,

Isn't this sort of a ridiculous requirement of the FCC? I'm surprised that nobody has seen fit to introduce a proposal to eliminate that part of the process.

Tony

```
-----
      o      o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE
        \    / system @ garlic.sbs.com                Soon W5YI VE
         \__/_/
          (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.
    /|_ _ _ _ \
  / | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's
* || { _ _ } ||
  || _ _ _ _ || (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)
  ^^      ^^
-----
```

-----  
Date: Tue, 27 Jul 1993 12:38:54 GMT  
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!darwin.sura.net!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!dgg.cr.usgs.gov!  
bodoh@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jul22.144236.25076@rsg1.er.usgs.gov>,  
<CAKz25.751@srngenprp.sr.hp.com>, <231qfnINNsgp@kralizec.zeta.org.au>  
Subject : Re: Code/NoCode

--  
Since the anti-no-coders seem convinced that learning code is a necessary hurdle because it requires some level of effort - why not allow hams to substitute a course in French for the code requirement? It could prove to be more useful in worldwide HF communications...

Actually, I'm not anti-code - I just thought I'd point out that if broadening your communication opportunities is a goal, there may be other alternatives...

+++++  
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer, Hughes STX, N0X?? (in the mail) +  
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +  
+ Internet; bodoh@dgg.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)

+  
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P  
+

+++++

-----

Date: 28 Jul 93 16:55:56 GMT  
From: anomaly.sbs.com!kd1nr!system@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CArxt0.71x@egr.uri.edu>, <iNcB8B7w165w@balsam.pinetree.org>,  
<CAsxp1.J2D@mentor.cc.purdue.edu>  
Subject : Re: Damn the torpedoes (was Re: 1947 No Code )

blumb@sage.cc.purdue.edu (Bill Blum) writes:

> I'm a Prospective Ham. :-)  
> I've got my study guides, etc.  
> I have the ARRL New Ham package.  
> I'm getting ready for the test.  
>  
> And I'm sick of people telling me I \_must\_ learn code.  
>  
> What does learning code have to do with building a satellite rig?  
> What does it have to do with setting up an antenna?  
> Not much.

You're right. But if you ever want to get on HF, don't scream for access  
without learning the code. It's pretty simple.

Tony

-----  
o o Tony Pelliccio, KD1NR, Control Op 441.750+, ARRL VE  
 \ / system @ garlic.sbs.com Soon W5YI VE  
 \\_\_/  
 (oo) Cow humor. Sort of like the Far Side.  
 /| \_\_\_ \/  
/ | {MTV} || MooTV - Rockin' Bumpin' and Funkin' into the 90's  
\* || {\_\_\_} ||  
 ||-----|| (And people thought my last .sig was long, ha!)  
 ^^ ^^  
-----

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #272

\*\*\*\*\*